

**STAFF REPORT/ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT
FOR
PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE WATER QUALITY
CONTROL PLAN FOR THE LAHONTAN REGION**

**CLARIFICATION OF WASTE DISCHARGE PROHIBITIONS
AND
SCHEDULES OF COMPLIANCE IN NATIONAL POLLUTANT
DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM PERMITS**

January 5, 2006

California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Lahontan Region
2501 Lake Tahoe Boulevard
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Contact Person:

Bud Amorfini, Environmental Scientist
Telephone: (530) 542-5463
Email: bamorfini@waterboards.ca.gov

STAFF REPORT OF PROPOSED BASIN PLAN AMENDMENTS AND ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT

CLARIFICATION OF WASTE DISCHARGE PROHIBITIONS AND STATEMENT OF NPDES COMPLIANCE SCHEDULES

I. Introduction

The Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (Lahontan Water Board) is the lead agency for proposed amendments to the *Water Quality Control Plan for the Lahontan Region* (Basin Plan). The Basin Planning Process has been certified by the Secretary of Resources as functionally equivalent to the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or Negative Declaration pursuant to CEQA. In lieu of these documents, however, the Lahontan Water Board is required to prepare the following: the Basin Plan amendment; and Environmental Checklist that identifies potentially significant adverse environmental impacts of the Basin Plan amendment as required by California Code of Regulations, title 23, section 3777; and a staff report that describes the proposed amendment, reasonable alternatives, and mitigation measures to minimize any significant adverse environmental impacts identified in the Checklist. The Basin Plan amendment, Environmental Checklist, and staff report are functionally equivalent to an EIR or Negative Declaration. This document includes the staff report, proposed Basin Plan Amendment (Attachment 1), and Environmental Checklist (Attachment 2).

Chapters 4 and 5 of the Basin Plan specify certain waste discharge prohibitions and include provisions for compliance schedules in discharge permits [waste discharge requirements (WDRs) and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits]. The Lahontan Water Board is planning to amend the Basin Plan text associated with these two items. The proposed Basin Plan amendments do not constitute a functional change in the Lahontan Water Board's regulatory approach, but are intended to clarify the applicability of the prohibitions and compliance schedule provisions. A discussion of the amendments follows.

II. Waste Discharge Prohibitions

Various waste discharge prohibitions are contained in the implementation sections of the Basin Plan, which are presented in Chapter 4 (Implementation) and Chapter 5 (Water Quality Standards and Control Measures for the Lake Tahoe Basin). The proposed clarifications to the waste discharge prohibitions are intended to address the prohibitions identified below.

Waste Discharge Prohibitions

For the Little Truckee River, Truckee River, East and West Forks Carson River, East and West Forks Walker River, and Lake Tahoe Hydrologic Units (HUs):

“The discharge of any waste or deleterious material to surface waters of the [...HU] is prohibited.” (Basin Plan, Chapter 4, Implementation, at p. 4.1-4.)

For the Little Truckee River, Truckee River and Lake Tahoe HUs, additional prohibitions are included as follows:

“The discharge, attributable to human activities, of solid or liquid waste materials, including but not limited to soil, silt, clay, sand, or other organic or earthen material, to surface waters of the [...HU] is prohibited.” (Basin Plan, Chapter 4, Implementation, at p. 4.1-4.)

“The discharge or threatened discharge attributable to human activities, of solid or liquid waste materials including soil, silt, clay, sand, and other organic and earthen materials to lands within the 100-year floodplain of the [Little Truckee River and Truckee River] or any tributary to the [Little Truckee River and Truckee River] is prohibited.” (Basin Plan, Chapter 4, Implementation, at p. 4.1-4.)

“The discharge or threatened discharge attributable to human activities, of solid or liquid waste materials including soil, silt, clay, sand, and other organic and earthen materials to lands below the highwater rim of Lake Tahoe or within the 100-year floodplain of any tributary to Lake Tahoe is prohibited.” (Basin Plan, Chapter 4, Implementation, at p. 4.1-4.)

If taken out of context, these prohibitions could be interpreted as prohibiting all storm water discharges, including those currently authorized under the Lahontan Water Board’s regulatory authority. This is clearly not the intent of the Lahontan Water Board, and the proposed amendments are needed to clarify that these prohibitions do not apply to storm water discharges that are controlled by appropriate management measures and that do not cause a violation of water quality objectives. For example, construction site or municipal storm water discharges are authorized if regulated under WDRs or NPDES permits. These discharges are not prohibited and existing regulatory programs are in place to prevent potential water quality degradation from these activities. Therefore, the Basin Plan amendment would reconcile the prohibition language with the regulatory authority and practices of the Lahontan Water Board as described below.

Proposed Amendment Language

The proposed amendment would insert the following statement immediately after the heading “Regionwide Prohibitions” in Section 4.1 of Chapter 4 (p. 4.1-1) of the Basin Plan:

Waste discharge prohibitions in this chapter and Chapter 5 (Water Quality Control Standards for the Lake Tahoe Basin) do not apply to discharges of stormwater when wastes in the discharge are controlled through the application

of management practices or other means and the discharge does not cause a violation of water quality objectives. For existing discharges, waste discharge requirements, including NPDES permits, may contain a time schedule for the application of control measures and compliance with water quality objectives. In general, the Regional Board expects that control measures will be implemented in an iterative manner as needed to meet applicable receiving water quality objectives.

Additionally, the proposed amendment would insert the following statement immediately after the heading “Regionwide Prohibitions” in Section 5.2 of Chapter 5 (p. 5.2-1) of the Basin Plan:

Waste discharge prohibitions in this chapter do not apply to discharges of stormwater when wastes in the discharge are controlled through the application of management practices or other means and the discharge does not cause a violation of water quality objectives. For existing discharges, waste discharge requirements, including NPDES permits, may contain a time schedule for the application of control measures and compliance with water quality objectives. In general, the Regional Board expects that control measures will be implemented in an iterative manner as needed to meet applicable receiving water quality objectives.

III. NPDES Permit Compliance Schedules

In some cases, immediate compliance with effluent limitations in NPDES permits or WDRs may be infeasible. Both the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) and the state Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (California Water Code – CWC) recognize compliance schedules as an important tool for bringing dischargers into compliance with water quality standards. Examples of situations where compliance schedules may be appropriate include:

- Setting new or revised effluent guidelines for existing permitted discharges and allowing the discharger a reasonable amount of time to comply with a more stringent limit;
- Establishing new or revised water quality standards that are more stringent and allowing an existing discharger a reasonable amount of time to comply;
- Allowing time for a discharger to develop implement storm water pollution control programs, including the installation of best management practices.

This mechanism is currently authorized statewide for non-NPDES WDRs under Article 4, Section 13263 of the CWC. For state-implemented NPDES programs, federal regulations implementing the CWA allow compliance schedules if two conditions are met: (1) the schedule requires compliance as soon as possible, but not later than applicable statutory deadlines under the CWA; and 2) the state water quality regulations

allow for a compliance schedule to comply with the water quality standards. The second condition in the federal regulation was interpreted in an USEPA Administrative Order (*In the Matter of Star-Kist Caribe, Inc.*, NPDES Appeal No. 88-5) as requiring an explicit statement in the state's water quality control plans (i.e., Basin Plans) that allows compliance schedules.¹

The Basin Plan refers to its authority to establish compliance schedules in discharge permits (WDRs and NPDES permits) in the region-wide Implementation Section (Chapter 4) and in the Lake Tahoe-specific section (Chapter 5). Although it has been interpreted that the Basin Plan currently authorizes the use of compliance schedules in NPDES permits, the proposed amendments are intended to more clearly satisfy the federal regulations as stated above.

The Basin Plan amendment will ensure that the Lahontan Water Board has the authority to include compliance schedules in NPDES permits when allowed by law and deemed appropriate by the Lahontan Water Board. Compliance schedules cannot be granted in NPDES permits if CWA statutory deadlines apply. These include deadlines for municipal POTW and industrial facility point-source discharges by July 1, 1977 for Best Practicable Technology (BPT), and March 31, 1989 for Best Available Technology (BAT) and Best Conventional Technology (BCT). Additionally, the *Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries* (hereafter *SIP*) applies to California Toxic Rule (CTR) constituents in NPDES permits and authorizes a compliance schedule for a period of five years. (*SIP*, p. 21; see also 40 C.F.R. section 131.38(d).)

The CWA statutory deadlines do not apply to storm water discharges and the *SIP* does not apply to discharges of toxic pollutants from combined sewer overflows or the regulation of storm water discharges. (*SIP* at p. 3, fn. 1.). Therefore, compliance schedules for certain regulated discharges, including those under storm water NPDES permits, are consistent with State Board municipal and industrial general storm water NPDES permits, and the state's general policy to follow an iterative process for implementing storm water control measures to meet water quality objectives.

The proposed Basin Plan Amendment language is presented below.

Proposed Amendment Language

Include the following revisions to the text of "Compliance Schedules" starting on page 4-3 of Chapter 4 – Implementation. Additions are shown in underline and deletions are shown in strikethrough.

¹ The Star-Kist Caribe order interprets Clean Water Act section 301(b)(1)(C), which provides that NPDES permits must require compliance with water quality-based effluent limitations by July 1, 1977. The order also states that immediate compliance must be achieved for any water quality standard that was adopted before July 1, 1977 and that has not been revised or newly interpreted after that date, make such water quality standards ineligible for compliance schedules in NPDES permits.

Compliance Schedules. The Porter-Cologne Act (CA Water Code § 13242[b]) requires a Basin Plan's program of implementation for achieving water quality objectives to include a "time schedule for the actions to be taken." Because of the lack of ambient water quality monitoring data for most of the water bodies of the Lahontan Region (see Chapter 7), it is not possible to state whether or not these waters are in achievement of all water quality objectives, or to set compliance schedules for achievement. The Regional Board periodically reviews available information on attainment of objectives and support of beneficial uses as part of the Water Quality Assessment (ongoing), Section 305(b) reporting (every two years), and Triennial Review (every three years) processes. These reviews may result in Basin Plan amendments and/or the issuance of new or revised discharge permits that ~~which~~ will include specific compliance schedules for particular dischargers or for all discharges affecting particular water bodies. The Regional Board is also required to prioritize impaired water bodies listed as "Water Quality Limited" under Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act for the development of "Total Maximum Daily Loads" (TMDLs) of pollutants to be used in setting wasteload allocations for dischargers, in order to ensure attainment of standards.

Where the Regional Board determines it is infeasible to achieve immediate compliance with water quality objectives adopted by the Regional Board or State Board, with water quality criteria adopted by the USEPA, or with an effluent limitation based on these objectives or criteria, the Regional Board may establish in NPDES permits a schedule of compliance in accordance with federal NPDES regulations (40 CFR §122.47). Compliance schedules may not be included that would violate federal Clean Water Act statutory requirements that are applicable to municipal POTWs and industrial point source discharges.

The schedule of compliance shall include a time schedule for completing specific actions that demonstrate reasonable progress toward the attainment of the objectives or criteria and shall contain a final compliance date, based on the shortest practical time (determined by the Regional Board) required to achieve compliance. Compliance schedules for California Toxic Rule (CTR) objectives shall comply with the provisions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP) [40 C.F.R. section 131.38(e)(6) and in the CTR-SIP, Section 2.1].

Schedules of compliance may also be included in NPDES storm water permits where an iterative approach is necessary to develop appropriate strategies and controls to meet water quality objectives.

~~The 1975 Basin Plans included recommendations that specific studies be carried out by specific dates on needs for community wastewater collection and treatment facilities in certain areas of the Lahontan Region. These plans also recommended that some communities construct specific facilities by given dates. Most of these schedules were not met. Because expected year-to-year changes in availability of and priorities for funding will ensure that long term schedules are unrealistic, this Basin Plan does not include such recommendations. Priorities are set on a short-~~

~~term basis for studies through the State Board's use of the Clean Water Strategy ranking system in various grant programs, and for facilities construction through the State Board Division of Clean Water Programs needs assessment process for loans and grants. Once funding is allocated, completion schedules are set through the contract process.~~

~~Some of the water quality control programs for the Lahontan Region do have specific compliance deadlines, which are discussed later in this Basin Plan. For example, the control measures for the Lake Tahoe Basin which are discussed in Chapter 5 are to be implemented over a 20-year period (through 2007) to ensure attainment of objectives. Some of the waste discharge prohibitions discussed later in this Chapter also include specific compliance dates.~~

~~The Regional Board maintains discharge permits (WDRs and NPDES permits) for point sources, each of which includes its own compliance schedule. Waste discharge permits for construction projects generally require implementation of Best Management Practices during and immediately after construction; long-term maintenance of permanent BMPs is expected. Regional Board enforcement orders for specific problems also include compliance schedules.~~

IV. Alternatives Analysis Discussion

California Code of Regulations, title 23, section 3777 states that any standard, rule, regulation, or plan proposed for board approval or adoption must be accompanied by a discussion of reasonable alternatives to that activity. The Preferred Alternative (i.e., this proposed amendment to the Basin Plan) and a No Action Alternative are discussed in this section.

Preferred Alternative

The *Preferred Alternative* is the adoption of the Basin Plan amendments incorporating the changes discussed in this report. The Basin Plan Amendments are needed to provide more clarity and specificity regarding the regulatory authority and functions of the Lahontan Water Board. The amendments are consistent with current Lahontan Water Board actions.

No Action Alternative

The *No Action* alternative means that the Lahontan Water Board would not adopt the Basin Plan amendments. This alternative may result in a misinterpretation of the waste discharge prohibitions, such as the prohibition of storm water discharges, even though the Lahontan Water Board authorizes controlled storm water discharges under its existing regulatory authority. Additionally, the no action alternative would avoid adding an explicit statement to allow schedules of compliance in NPDES permits issued by the Lahontan Water Board. Since the Lahontan Water Board periodically includes, and intends to continue including, compliance schedules in NPDES permits, this alternative

could compromise the Lahontan Water Board's authority to use this regulatory tool for water quality improvement.

V. Other Considerations

California Water Code Section 13241 includes a list of factors that must be considered by Regional Boards when establishing water quality objectives. The proposed Basin Plan amendments do not establish or revise water quality objectives; therefore, Section 13241 does not apply to this project. CEQA (Public Resources Code Sections 21159 and 21159.4) requires Regional Boards to analyze reasonable means of compliance with new pollution control requirements or new performance standards. The proposed Basin Plan amendments do not set new pollution control requirements or performance standards. Therefore, no analysis of compliance under CEQA Section 21159 is required in this environmental document.

VI. Environmental Impact Evaluation

A checklist of potential environmental impacts for the proposed Basin Plan amendments is presented in Attachment 2. Based on the Environmental Checklist, staff concludes that there would be no potentially significant impacts on the environment caused by adoption of the Basin Plan amendment. Therefore, adoption of this amendment would have no effect on the existing environment and would not require mitigation measures. Furthermore, no potentially significant impacts associated with this project were identified because the amendments are editorial in nature and do not change any existing regulatory functions of the Lahontan Water Board.

ATTACHMENT 1

BASIN PLAN AMENDMENTS FOR WASTE DISCHARGE PROHIBITION CLARIFICATION AND NPDES COMPLIANCE SCHEDULE PROVISION

Waste Discharge Prohibitions

Insert the following immediately after the heading “Regionwide Prohibitions” in section 4.1 (p. 4.1-1):

Waste discharge prohibitions in this chapter and Chapter 5 (Water Quality Control Standards for the Lake Tahoe Basin) do not apply to discharges of stormwater when wastes in the discharge are controlled through the application of management practices or other means and the discharge does not cause a violation of water quality objectives. For existing discharges, waste discharge requirements, including NPDES permits, may contain a time schedule for the application of control measures and compliance with water quality objectives. In general, the Regional Board expects that control measures will be implemented in an iterative manner as needed to meet applicable receiving water quality objectives.

Insert the following immediately after the heading “Regionwide Prohibitions” in section 5.2 (p. 5.2-1):

Waste discharge prohibitions in this chapter do not apply to discharges of stormwater when wastes in the discharge are controlled through the application of management practices or other means and the discharge does not cause a violation of water quality objectives. For existing discharges, waste discharge requirements, including NPDES permits, may contain a time schedule for the application of control measures and compliance with water quality objectives. In general, the Regional Board expects that control measures will be implemented in an iterative manner as needed to meet applicable receiving water quality objectives.

Compliance Schedules

Chapter 4

Include the following revisions to the text of “Compliance Schedules” starting on page 4-3 of Chapter 4 – Implementation.

Compliance Schedules. The Porter-Cologne Act (CA Water Code § 13242[b]) requires a Basin Plan's program of implementation for achieving water quality objectives to include a “time schedule for the actions to be taken.” Because of the lack of ambient water quality monitoring data for most of the water bodies of the

Lahontan Region (see Chapter 7), it is not possible to state whether or not these waters are in achievement of all water quality objectives, or to set compliance schedules for achievement. The Regional Board periodically reviews available information on attainment of objectives and support of beneficial uses as part of the Water Quality Assessment (ongoing), Section 305(b) reporting (every two years), and Triennial Review (every three years) processes. These reviews may result in Basin Plan amendments and/or the issuance of new or revised discharge permits that ~~which~~ will include specific compliance schedules for particular dischargers or for all discharges affecting particular water bodies. The Regional Board is also required to prioritize impaired water bodies listed as "Water Quality Limited" under Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act for the development of "Total Maximum Daily Loads" (TMDLs) of pollutants to be used in setting wasteload allocations for dischargers, in order to ensure attainment of standards.

Where the Regional Board determines it is infeasible to achieve immediate compliance with water quality objectives adopted by the Regional Board or State Board, with water quality criteria adopted by the USEPA, or with an effluent limitation based on these objectives or criteria, the Regional Board may establish in NPDES permits a schedule of compliance in accordance with federal NPDES regulations (40 CFR §122.47). Compliance schedules may not be included that would violate federal Clean Water Act statutory requirements that are applicable to municipal POTWs and industrial point source discharges.

The schedule of compliance shall include a time schedule for completing specific actions that demonstrate reasonable progress toward the attainment of the objectives or criteria and shall contain a final compliance date, based on the shortest practical time (determined by the Regional Board) required to achieve compliance. Compliance schedules for California Toxic Rule (CTR) objectives shall comply with the provisions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP) [40 C.F.R. section 131.38(e)(6) and in the CTR-SIP, Section 2.1].

Schedules of compliance may also be included in NPDES storm water permits where an iterative approach is necessary to develop appropriate strategies and controls to meet water quality objectives.

~~The 1975 Basin Plans included recommendations that specific studies be carried out by specific dates on needs for community wastewater collection and treatment facilities in certain areas of the Lahontan Region. These plans also recommended that some communities construct specific facilities by given dates. Most of these schedules were not met. Because expected year-to-year changes in availability of and priorities for funding will ensure that long term schedules are unrealistic, this Basin Plan does not include such recommendations. Priorities are set on a short-term basis for studies through the State Board's use of the Clean Water Strategy ranking system in various grant programs, and for facilities construction through~~

~~the State Board Division of Clean Water Programs needs assessment process for loans and grants. Once funding is allocated, completion schedules are set through the contract process.~~

~~Some of the water quality control programs for the Lahontan Region do have specific compliance deadlines, which are discussed later in this Basin Plan. For example, the control measures for the Lake Tahoe Basin which are discussed in Chapter 5 are to be implemented over a 20-year period (through 2007) to ensure attainment of objectives. Some of the waste discharge prohibitions discussed later in this Chapter also include specific compliance dates.~~

~~The Regional Board maintains discharge permits (WDRs and NPDES permits) for point sources, each of which includes its own compliance schedule. Waste discharge permits for construction projects generally require implementation of Best Management Practices during and immediately after construction; long-term maintenance of permanent BMPs is expected. Regional Board enforcement orders for specific problems also include compliance schedules.~~

ATTACHMENT 2
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST
Basin Plan Amendments to Waste Discharge Prohibitions and
Authority to Establish NPDES Compliance Schedules

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Lahontan Region (hereafter Lahontan Water Board) is the Lead Agency for evaluating the environmental impacts of the proposed amendment to the Water Quality Control Plan for the Lahontan Region, North and South Basins (Basin Plan) to incorporate authorization of compliance schedules in NPDES permits. The Secretary of Resources has certified the basin planning process as exempt from certain requirements under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), including preparation of an initial study, a negative declaration and environmental impact report. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 15251.) As this proposed amendment to the Basin Plan is part of the basin planning process, the amendment is considered “functionally equivalent” to an initial study, negative declaration, and environmental impact report.

Any regulatory program of the Lahontan Water Board certified as functionally equivalent, however, must satisfy the documentation requirements of California Code of Regulations, title 23, section 3777(a), which requires the following evaluation.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				X
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				X
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES- Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				X
III. AIR QUALITY- Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				X
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				X
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				X
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				X
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	..			X
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?				X
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?				X
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				X
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				X
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				X
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
iv) Landslides?				X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				X
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				X
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				X
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				X
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				X
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				X
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				X
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				X
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				X
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				X
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?				X
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X
X. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X
XI. NOISE -- Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				X
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				X
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				X
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?				X
Police protection?				X
Schools?				X
Parks?				X
Other public facilities?				X
XIV. RECREATION				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?				X
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				X
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				X
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				X
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				X
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?				X
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				X